



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,125	02/06/2001	Edward J. Cesarczyk	49945 (70116)	3199

7590

05/06/2002

Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman
Intellectual Property Practice Group of
EDWARDS & ANGELL
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209

EXAMINER

ALEXANDER, LYLE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1743

4

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF-4

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/778,125

Applicant(s)

CESARCZYK

Examiner

LYLE A ALEXANDER

Art Unit

1743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>3</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claims 1-10, 17-20 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Bachand et al.

Bachand et al. teach a specimen collecting and testing device having an elongated hollow housing with a test membrane(21), a fluid chamber(26), an elongated handle(33) with an absorbent member(32) for collecting the sample. The handle(33) is pulled through slot(36) into expresser port(20) where the sample is squeezed from the member(32) [see page 3 column 1].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 11-13,15-16 abd 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bachand et al.

See Bachand et al. supra.

Bachand et al. is silent to the material of absorbent member, the material of the handle and if the handle is hollow and the use of preservatives.

The court decided In re Leshin (125 USPQ 416) the selection of known materials on the basis of suitability of intended use would be entirely obvious. It would have been within the skill of the art to select the member as a polyurethane foam and the handle made of paper or plastic as selection of material based upon its intended use.

The court decided In re Boesch (205 USPQ 215) that optimization of a result effective variable is ordinarily within the skill of the art. Result effective variables have well known and predictable results. It is known to use preservatives to achieve the well known and expected result of preservation. It is also known to make handles hollow to achieve the well known and expected results of reducing cost of manufacture and shipping weight. It would have been within the skill of the art to modify Bachand et al. and use a preservative and a hollow handle as optimization of a result effective variable to gain the above advantages.

Application/Control Number:
09/778,125
Art Unit: 1743

Page 4

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Lennon et al. teaches a test device that expresses a sample from a swab and the sample contact a test element.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LYLE A ALEXANDER whose telephone number is 703-308-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY,WEDNESDAY,FRIDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JILL WARDEN can be reached on 703-308-4037. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-3330 for regular communications and 703-872-3331 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.



LYLE A ALEXANDER
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1743

May 2, 2002